



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/551,251	09/15/2006	Ananya Mukhopadhyay	4544-052909	1805		
28289	7590	03/17/2009	EXAMINER			
THE WEBB LAW FIRM, P.C. 700 KOPPERS BUILDING 436 SEVENTH AVENUE PITTSBURGH, PA 15219				CHANG, SUNRAY		
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER				
2121						
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE				
03/17/2009		PAPER				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/551,251	MUKHOPADHYAY, ANANYA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sunray R. Chang	2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 13-30 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 13-30 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 – www.uspto.gov

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

1. This Office Action is responsive to preliminary amendment, filed on January 2nd, 2009;
Claims 1 – 12 have been cancelled.
Claims 13 – 30 are presented without amendment.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments regarding “**Barker** patent does not teach or hot rolled coils” which is respectfully disagreed. **Barker** reference teaches “hot-forming of the rod … in a type of rolling mill” as indicated in the col. 6, lines 33 – 42;
3. Further, regarding “**Barker** patent does not disclose a process for use through a multiple stand rolling mill” is also disagreed, even this limitation is not in the claim, **Barker** reference still can be found teaching a rolling mill includes a plurality of roll stands in col. 6, lines 4 – 7]
4. Regarding “**Barker** patent fails to teach or suggest field devices for measuring process parameters during hot rolling” which is disagreed; **Barker** reference teaches variables in the rolling stage are monitored and displayed which is “on-line”, further teaches “monitoring temperature and flow rate by programmable logic controller during casting process, which is still part of the whole processes. Further, applicant claims for “measuring process parameters” not as argued as “physical property of the rolling mill”.

5. Regarding the argued paragraph as indicated below, which can not be found in the claims, no response would be provided

“In contrast, the present application has instrumentation and field devices as shown in Fig. 3 of the current application (FD1-FDN) which obtain real-time process related data. The mechanical properties yield strength (YS), ultimate tensile strength (UTS), and percentage elongation (EL) are measured over the length and through the thickness of the coil. They are displayed on a display unit and for every coil various positions of the strip as shown in Fig. 4 of the present application. Such an on-line prediction system helps the rolling mill operator take corrective action to get nearly uniform mechanical properties along the length of the strip. This data is then sent to a computation module for processing”

6. Regarding “The Barker patent does not teach or suggest predicting physical properties of the cast bar” which can be found in **Barker** reference “data used to predict or obtain the desired cast bar characteristics required to produce the desired rod properties”(col. 13, line 67 – col. 14, line 1); no further explanation needs to be provided. Therein, “mechanical properties” can be anything related to be process, tool, material, rod, bar, etc.

7. Regarding **Carnes** reference has been cited to be combined with **Barker** reference to show further limitation “the properties could be considered along the length and through the thickness of a strip” for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys.

8. Regarding claims 18 – 22 and 26, since the **Barker** reference and **Carnes** reference either individually or in combination teach the features/functions of the claimed sub-modules, which can be simply function related circuitry which can be independent from or integral with the whole system since they are “sub-modules”.

9. Attached below with the rejection to the claims, since applicant does not amend the claims, the examiner does not change the rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **Claim(s) 13 – 30 is/are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over George W. Barker et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,289,867, and referred to as **Barker** hereinafter), and in view of Robert W. Carnes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,770,832, and referred to as **Carnes** hereinafter).

Regarding claim(s) 13,

Barker teaches,

- A system for on-line display of property prediction for hot rolled coils in a hot strip mill; [variables in the rolling stage are monitored and displayed by the supervisory computer ... one or more of these variables can affect the physical properties of the rod during rolling.

The supervisory computer can produce a change in value of these variables if the desired physical properties of the rod are not achieved as indicated by the information generated by the historical data generating means, col. 8, lines 19 – 30]

- a unit for providing data on rolling schedule with chemistry from the steel making stage; [236, product input, fig. 2; col. 6, line 44 – col. 7, line 13]
- one or more field devices for measuring process parameters during hot rolling; [flowmeter, 239, fig. 2]
- a programmable logic controller for acquiring data of measured parameters from said field devices and transmitting said data parameters to a processor; [monitored by programmable logic controller ..., col. 14, lines 34 - 66; fig. 2]
- means for converting the measured data from time domain to space domain using segment tracking; [values corresponding to a particular physical property, e.g., tensile strength, and values corresponding to actual flow rates monitored by the programmable logic controller 37 during the run are then processed by the supervisory computer 35 to determine whether the actual physical property of the rod is within the preset tolerance for the physical property which was input into the supervisory computer 35 at the initiation of the process. If the rod is out of tolerance, the supervisory computer 35, in cooperation with an historical data generating means 42, will calculate a new set point for the programmable logic controller 37 that is expected to bring the physical property into tolerance, col. 14, lines 34 – 66]

The examiner further explains, the definition of “segment tracking” in specification (page 8 – 9) is not clear how to “track” and how the “tracking” can be used to convert data from “time domain to space domain”, since the paragraphs indicates the purpose

for “segment tracking” is to “obtain the process history” and “converting time domain data to space domain data” has been interpreted as “display”, which can be found in **Barker** reference as indicated above.

- a computation module for processing data for predicting mechanical properties of the strip being rolled; [used to predict or obtain the desired cast bar characteristics required to produce the desired rod properties, col. 13, line 62 – col. 14, line 4]
- said predicted data on mechanical properties outputted from said computation module is stored in another unit for use by said scheduling unit at production planning and scheduling level. [may be saved or adjusted by the supervisory computer for future use based on this historical data, col. 4, lines 9 - 14]

Barker does not teach predicting mechanical properties along the length and through the thickness of the strip being rolled;

Carnes teaches predicting mechanical properties along the length and through the thickness of the strip [product of the measured width and the nominal pipe wall thickness, col. 8, lines 33 – 38], for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant’s invention to modify the teaching of **Barker** to include “predicting mechanical properties along the length and through the thickness of the strip”, for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

Regarding claim(s) 14,

Barker teaches, the system as claimed in claim 13, wherein

- said field devices include one or more of a pyrometer, a speedometer, a thickness gauge, and a solenoid valve for measuring data on process parameters. [radiation temperature sensors, col. 14, lines 34 – 38]

Regarding claim(s) 15 – 17 and 25,

Barker teaches, the system as claimed, wherein,

- said programmable logic controller is a Westinghouse PLC 26 connected to said field devices through coaxial cable using remote I/O. [programmable logic controller, 237, fig. 2]
- said programmable logic controller is configured to capture data from said field devices over 0.01 sec. using WESTNET I data highway with Daisy Chain Network topology. [programmable logic controller, 237, fig. 2]
- said processor is an ALSTOM VXI 186 processor and the data transfer between said processor and said programmable logic controller is through WESTNET II using coaxial cable with Token Pass Network topology. [supervisory computer , 235, fig. 2]

Since there is no indication regarding the purpose for using these specific PLC/Daisy chain/Token Pass/ALSTOM VXI/WESTNET I (II), they can be treated as a regular PLC/network/computer; further, this PLC/processor/network is a well known in the art product, not applicants' own invention.

Regarding claim(s) 18 and 26,

Carnes teaches the system with said computation module includes a deformation sub-module for determining final austenite grain size after finish rolling. [deformation, austenite grain size, col. 6, lines 51 – 65], for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

Regarding claim(s) 19,

Barker teaches, the system as claimed in claim 13, wherein said computation module includes a thermal sub-module for determining the temperature drop during radiation while cooling said hot rolled strip. [to cool the cast bar, col. 4, lines 15 – 21]

Regarding claim(s) 20,

Carnes teaches the system wherein said computation module includes a microstructural sub-module for determining microstructural changes during phase transformation. [microstructural, col. 9, lines 5 – 33; microstructure has been changed, col. 28 – 40], for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18], for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

Regarding claim(s) 21,

Carnes teaches the system as claimed in claim 13, wherein

- said computation module includes a precipitation sub-module for determining an amount of aluminum nitrogen in a solid solution and in precipitates after cooling. [microalloying, col. 6,

lines 9 – 18], for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

Regarding claim(s) 22,

Carnes teaches the system as claimed in claim 13, wherein

- said computation module includes a structural property correlation sub-module for calculating a yield strength [col. 5, lines 9 – 11], ultimate tensile strength [col. 8, lines 25 – 55] and percentage elongation [col. 8, lines 47 – 55] based on the phases present, for the purpose of determining and controlling the cooling rate for metal alloys [col. 1, lines 17 – 18].

Regarding claim(s) 23, 27 and 28,

Barker teaches, the system wherein

- the system includes a display unit for displaying one or more of a cooling temperature, ferrite grain size, yield strength, ultimate tensile strength, percentage elongation and nitrogen in solid solution/precipitate. [col. 8, lines 19 – 26]

Regarding claim(s) 24, 29 and 30,

Barker teaches, the system wherein

- the system includes a data warehousing device for storing the data generated by said computation module. [col. 4, lines 9 – 12]

Conclusion

10. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence Information

11. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 6:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3682 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3682 or email sunray.chang@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (571) 273-8300.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful in the regular office hour, the Examiner's Supervisor, Albert Decady, may be reached at (571) 272-3819.

Sunray Chang
Art Unit 2121
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

/Albert DeCady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2121

Application/Control Number: 10/551,251
Art Unit: 2121

Page 11

March 18, 2009
